

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/496,824	JUELS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Syed Zia	2131	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Syed Zia. (3) Ari Juels.  
 (2) Ronald R. Demsher. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 02/16-17/06, 02/20.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: Liao, Merkle, and Benson.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*Examiner initiated this interview to resolve the pending issues on following dates:  
Feb 16 & 17, 2006*

*During interview inventor explained the concept of 'Client Puzzle' and how this can be used to during Denial of Service attack. A inventor also explained the "Computational task".*

*Examiner pointed out the patentable material. That is and mentioned and discussed in detail how to overcome prior art rejection. Examiner specifically requested to include "Client Puzzle" and Client puzzle transactional life cycle in the independent claims.*

*Examiner also requested to move claim 3, 6-7, 20, 31, 34-35 & 57 to be respective independent claims. Attorney agreed to submit the amendment.  
Feb 20, 2006*

*Examiner received claim amendment, but there was no mention of "Client Puzzle".*

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an *or the objected claim*  
 Attachment to a signed Office action. *Examiner called again but* Examiner's signature, if required

*Attorney informed that because of holiday inventor is not available.*

*[Signature]*  
 2/20/2006